

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**DILLON YUDELL LLP**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

FEB 21 2005

## USPTO FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

|               |                                |                                     |                                     |
|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| TO:           | Examiner Rudy Andrew           | FROM:                               | Eustace P. Isidore, Reg. No. 56,104 |
| ORGANIZATION: | US Patent and Trademark Office | DATE:                               | February 21, 2005                   |
| ART UNIT:     | 3627                           | CONFIRMATION NO.:                   |                                     |
|               |                                | TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER: | 9                                   |
| FAX NUMBER:   | 703-872-9306                   | APPLICATION SERIAL NO.:             | 09/535,559                          |
| ENCLOSED:     | Appeal Brief                   | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.:                | AUS000060US1                        |

☒ URGENT   ☐ FOR REVIEW   ☐ PLEASE COMMENT   ☐ PLEASE REPLY   ☐ PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

This fax from the law firm of Dillon & Yudell LLP contains information that is confidential or privileged, or both. This information is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named on this fax cover letter. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this information by any person other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us by telephone immediately at 512.343.6116 so that we can arrange for the retrieval of the transmitted documents at no cost to you.

8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110, AUSTIN, TEXAS 78759  
512.343.6116 (V) • 512.343.6446 (F) • DILLONYUDELL.COM

FEB 21 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: AUS000060US1

In re Application of:

RABINDRANATH DUTTA

Serial No.: 09/535,559

Filed: March 27, 2000

For: THIRD PARTY CONTRACT  
DEPOSITORY FOR E-COMMERCE  
TRANSACTIONS§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Examiner: RUDY, ANDREW J.

Art Unit: 3627

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.192Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Brief is submitted in support of the Appeal of the Examiner's final rejection of Claims 5, 7, 11-14 and 19-20 in the above-identified application. A Notice of Appeal was filed in this case on December 21, 2004 and received in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on December 21, 2004. Please charge the fee of \$500.00 due under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(c) for filing the brief, as well as any additional required fees, to IBM Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Certificate of Transmission/Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at 703-872-9306 or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Typed or Printed Name: Jane GrahamDate: February 21, 2005Signature: Rauder

AUS000060US1

Appeal Brief

Serial No. 09/535,559

1

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest in the present Application is International Business Machines Corporation, the Assignee of the present application as evidenced by the Assignment set forth at reel 010712, frame 0812.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

An appeal filed in related patent application Serial Number 09/534,595 (Atty. Doc. AUS000060US2) filed on December 15, 2003 may directly affect or be directly affected by the Board's decision in the present appeal. There are no other appeals or interferences known to Appellant, the Appellant's legal representative, or assignee, which directly affect or would be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Following a non-final action dated April 15, 2004, Appellant filed an Amendment to the claims, which amendment included new claims 21-27. In the Final Action dated October 8, 2004, Examiner restricted new claims 21-27 from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. The remaining claims, i.e., Claims 5, 7, 11-14 and 19-20, were finally rejected, and the rejection of Claims 5, 7, 11-14 and 19-20 is being appealed.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No amendments to the remaining claims have been made subsequent to the final rejection that leads to this Appeal.

**SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Appellant's claimed invention provides a database/depository that stores documents generated by an E-commerce transaction. The database is independent of the server and client system that complete the transaction, and the database generates a document ID for each document that is stored therein. This database-generated document ID (i.e., one generated at the database during storage therein and not one generated at the server during the transaction) is described in the claims as a separate/different ID from the transaction ID generated by the server

AUS000060US1

Appeal Brief

Serial No. 09/535,559

2

during the transaction. Providing a separate database-generated ID along with the transaction ID allows for independent storage of the created document.

Appellant's claims recite several novel features including the following:

*means for automatically receiving an electronic document dynamically generated ... at an E-commerce server ... independent of the electronic database, whereby said electronic document stored at said electronic database cannot be modified by either party to the E-commerce transaction;*

*means for generating a document identifier (ID) ... at said database; ... and*

*means for transmitting said document ID to each party to said E-commerce transaction*

*(emphasis added).*

Notably, exemplary Claim 11 specifically recites:

*wherein said document ID is generated at said depository and is separate from a transaction ID assigned to the E-commerce transaction.*

#### **GROUND'S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

- A. The Examiner's rejection of Claims 5, 7, 11-14, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Quelene* (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,306) is to be reviewed on Appeal.

#### **ARGUMENT**

- A. Examiner's rejection of Claims 5, 7, 11-14, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Quelene* is not well founded and should be reversed.

Independently Generating and Transmitting a Document ID Different From The Transaction ID (Claims 5, 7, 11-14, 19 and 20).

The specific language of Appellants claimed invention is recited above. A careful reading of *Quelene* reveals that *Quelene* is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of any one of

the above highlighted features of Appellant's claims and their associated element. Specifically, *Quelene* fails to teach or suggest any one of:

- (1) means for generating a document identifier (ID) ... at said database;...
- (2) means for transmitting said document ID to each party to said E-commerce transaction; or
- (3) wherein said document ID is generated at said depository and is separate from a transaction ID assigned to the E-commerce transaction

Examiner glosses over the specific features recited in Appellant's claims by stating generally that *Quelene* discloses "an electronic database where an electronic document has an associated identifier and is stored." Examiner also states that "it is common knowledge ... to provide non-modifiable read access electronic databases having a document identifier stored at a electronic database."

Examiner fails to tie in the teachings of *Quelene* with any of the functional features provided by Appellants claimed invention. It is clear that *Quelene* does not teach or suggest generating the document ID at the database or that the document ID generated is different from the transaction ID of the e-commerce transaction that created the document. Notably, during a telephonic conference with Appellant's representative, Examiner informally agreed that providing two different IDs (a database-generated document ID and a transaction ID) was not provided by either *Quelene* or "Ebay" (referenced without support within the final rejection).

Thus, *Quelene* does not render Appellant's claimed invention obvious to one skilled in the art because *Quelene* is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the above listed or other features recited by Appellant's claims. Examiner's rejection is therefore not well founded and should be reversed.

**CONCLUSION**

Appellant has pointed out with specificity the manifest error in the Examiner's rejections, and the claim language that renders the invention patentable over the reference. Appellant, therefore, respectfully requests that this case be remanded to the Examiner with instructions to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Eustace P. Isidore  
Reg. No. 56,104  
DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512-343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

**APPENDIX**

1-4. (canceled)

5. An electronic database used as a depository for electronic documents generated during E-commerce transactions, comprising:

means for automatically receiving an electronic document dynamically generated from information provided during an E-commerce transaction that has completed at an E-commerce server, which server is independent of the electronic database, whereby said electronic document stored at said electronic database cannot be modified by either party to the E-commerce transaction;

means for generating a document identifier (ID) for said received E-commerce generated electronic document, wherein said document ID is generated at said database;

means for storing said E-commerce generated electronic document with said document ID; and

means for transmitting said document ID to each party to said E-commerce transaction that produced said electronic document.

6. (canceled)

7. The electronic database of Claim 5, wherein said means for storing further comprises:

means for allowing a later read access to said E-commerce generated electronic document by a party to said E-commerce transaction; and

means for preventing modifications to said E-commerce generated electronic document after said document has been stored.

8-10. (canceled)

11. A depository for ensuring authenticity of electronic documents generated during E-commerce transactions, said depository comprising:

means for enabling automatic receipt of an electronic document that is dynamically generated in response to a completion of an E-commerce transaction in which information

AUS000060US1

Appeal Brief  
6

Serial No. 09/535,559

utilized to generate said electronic document is provided, wherein said E-commerce transaction is completed at a server that is independent of said depository;

means for generating a document identifier (ID) to identify said E-commerce generated electronic document being stored at the depository, wherein said document ID is generated at said depository and is separate from a transaction ID assigned to the E-commerce transaction; and

means for storing said E-commerce generated electronic document in said depository along with said document ID that is utilized to reference and retrieve said electronic document from said depository.

12. The depository of Claim 11, wherein said storing means includes:

means for limiting a write access of said electronic document to a first access; and

means for restricting subsequent access to said electronic document to read-only access, such that no changes may be made to said electronic document once it has been stored.

13. The depository of Claim 11, further including:

means for controlling a read and write access to said electronic depository, wherein said electronic document is stored in a write-once, read-many format;

means for providing said document ID to each party of the E-commerce transaction; and

means for later retrieving said electronic document for read access by a party to said E-commerce transaction utilizing said document ID.

14. The depository of Claim 13 wherein said controlling means further includes:

means for enabling a non-modification function for said electronic document, wherein a control code of said electronic depository is activated to prevent later modification to said electronic document; and

when said depository also stores other documents that are not generated by the E-commerce transactions, means for flagging each E-commerce generated electronic document stored within said electronic depository to allow only a later read access to said E-commerce generated electronic document by a party to said E-commerce transaction, wherein write access is permitted for said other documents that are not flagged.



15-18. (canceled)

19. The electronic database of Claim 5, further comprising:

means for connecting said electronic database to a separate, independent server at which said E-commerce transactions are conducted; and

means for enabling communication between said server and said electronic database via said connecting means.

20. The depository of Claim 11, further comprising:

means for connecting said depository to a separate, independent server at which said E-commerce transactions are conducted; and

means for enabling communication between said server and said depository via said connecting means.